

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6817

The Post has revealed in its news columns how the firm rushed the drug into human testing after sketchy trials with animals and omitted from its promotion possibly dangerous effects in body metabolism. A U.S. grand jury is now probing whether the firm also violated Federal law. A key question is whether the firm told FDA the truth about cataracts in test rodents and later in dogs.

In addition to withdrawn drugs there are others still on the market which were advertised as unusually safe but which have since been the subject of warnings of scattered severe damage.

Why are not such dangers discovered in advance so drugs can be kept off the market—or at least so that doctors can be warned?

Part of the answer is some companies' haste and carelessness. Part is within FDA, which has only 12 medical officers to handle some 400 new drug applications every year. Part is the still rudimentary knowledge of how drugs work. (We don't even know how that old, old wonder drug aspirin does its job.) Part is the immense variability of side effects.

Dr. M. L. Rosenheim, a London specialist, recently gave a symposium this six-part classification:

Overdose effects: Damage may result from simple excess dosage, or "alterations in the metabolic state of the patient may lead to the normal dose producing an excessive effect." Morphine is more potent, for example, if the liver is impaired.

Intolerance effect: A "lowered threshold to normal [drug] action" is partly due to the natural variety of humans, partly to enzyme defects.

True side effects: "Therapeutically undesirable but unavoidable effects of the [normal] action of the drug." The anti-metabolites used to fight cancer are an obvious example; the hope is that they will harm cancer cells more than normal ones.

Secondary effects: Such as a vitamin deficiency or a superinfection because antibiotics have altered the bacterial balance inside the body, or an uncontrolled infection because cortisone lowers immunity defenses.

Idiosyncrasy: An inherent abnormal reaction apparently inheritable. An example is a hemolytic anemia, suffered to excess by Negroes given Primaquine (an antimalarial drug of Winthrop Laboratories).

Hypersensitivity: Conditioned by previous exposure. This allergic reaction explains the fatal shock reactions from penicillin and may explain many blood complications with other drugs.

Allowing for the fact that animals are not men, most of the damage from overdose, true side effects and secondary effects can be anticipated from animal tests if enough species are used, if dosages are big enough and if care is taken at autopsy to pinpoint the clues in subtle damage. The other perils are virtually impossible to foretell.

Dr. V. B. Mattila, vice president of Roche Laboratories (one of the few drug officials who publicly says the Kefauver hearings were a good thing), stressed these difficulties when asked about Marllid, the first psychic energizer taken off the market last year because of deaths from hepatitis.

It had been tested for 5 years and marketed for 2 more as an antituberculosis drug before it was marketed in 1957 as an antidepressant.

Later that year the company got its first reports of possibly connected hepatitis and says it immediately alerted the FDA. Early in 1958 a west coast doctor publicly blamed a hepatitis death on Marllid—something he couldn't actually know from one case since all damage to the liver looks a lot alike.

Despite 33 fatal hepatitis cases among some 450,000 treated, the FDA left the drug

on the market then because it had no rivals to combat depression; now it does. Promotion stopped in late 1959. Sales were officially canceled early in 1961 in the United States but it is still on sale overseas.

Whatever criticism might be made of the delay in stopping sales, it is a fact that Marllid's liver damage has not been duplicated in animals. And there is the puzzle that no hepatitis was laid to it in all the years of TB use. Is there a protective factor in TB or a danger-disposing factor in mental illness? No one knows.

Who is to blame for the hard sell, the deliberate effort to make every drug the drug? Mainly the companies, of course, with varying degrees of guilt. But the doctor who writes the prescription must take a share, because sources of evaluation do exist. The AMA's Council on Drugs does a creditable job. And for more trenchant judgments, there are the Medical Letter, an independent biweekly newsletter, and Dr. Walter Modell's biennial "Drugs of Choice." Unfortunately, their sales are small.

Also importantly to blame is the yearning of the public to believe in a miracle and the occasional unjustified enthusiasm of the Government. The history of the miracle painkiller of 1959 is instructive.

In January HEW Secretary Flemming called in the press to make an announcement which he said gave him "more satisfaction than any other I have ever made"—the development at the National Institutes of Health of a new painkiller "10 times as effective as morphine, 50 times as effective as codeine" and with negligible addicting effect. The story of NIH-7519, phenazocine, was widely told, with only Time magazine, in the lay press, skeptical.

Gradually, quietly, the various professional evaluations cut NIH-7519 down to size. In "Drugs in Current Use—1962" Modell identifies it tersely as an "addictive analgesic related to morphine. No advantages * * * have been established."

Though few drugs get such a high-level launching, the NIH-7519 story is repeated again and again.

On the basis of the examples in this article and scores of others, the Medical Letter advises doctors:

"Except in serious disorders where older and safer drugs are ineffective, no new drug should be employed in [private] practice unless controlled clinical trials and extensive experience have clearly established its effectiveness and safety."

"Most drugs clear FDA," the newsletter went on, "on animal experiments, very limited human toxicity studies, physicians' testimonials, and usually uncontrolled clinical trials."

"All promotion statements that a new drug has few, mild, or no side effects should be ignored."

Address of Mayor Wagner at Fifth Annual Convention of New York State AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include herein the address made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York,

on September 10 at the opening session of the Fifth Annual Convention of the New York State AFL-CIO, which was held in New York City this week.

Because of the exemplary and forward-looking program put into effect by the city of New York to assist and safeguard our labor force there, I believe the mayor's address should be given widespread coverage, and for that reason I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT OPENING SESSION OF FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEW YORK STATE AFL-CIO, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1962

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome this convention to New York again.

You should, of course, feel very much at home here. With 1 million organized workers in this city, it is widely and wisely regarded as a labor town. We are glad to wear the union label.

But when I say that New York is regarded as a labor town, it doesn't necessarily mean what some might think it means. What it does mean is that here the problems of working people are recognized as being of primary concern to the city government.

New York City cares about the welfare and interests of those who work for a living with hand or brain. With the help of the labor movement, among others, we have been able to translate our concern into programs of meaningful social and economic action. But we still have far to go. And in these times of change, we must look ahead to tomorrow's problems, today.

Here in New York City, we have made an economic study of the shape of the labor market as it will be in 1970. This was undertaken by our city's own department of labor. The results of this study constitute a challenge to us all.

First, it shows a growing need for the training of workers in specialized skills because the demand for unskilled labor will continue to decline at an increasing rate in the years immediately ahead.

Furthermore, this study shows that by 1970 our labor force will include more women, more young people under 25, and more non-white Americans.

By 1970, one out of every three workers in New York City will be a woman. Today, only one out of every four is a woman. One of the steps we must take to anticipate this development is legislation requiring equal pay for equal work. I have favored this for a long time. We must also take steps to create additional day care centers for the children of working mothers, under the terms of the Federal Welfare Act of 1962 which extends Federal grants-in-aid for this purpose, but requires enabling legislation by the State.

By 1970, our survey predicts that one in every five workers in New York City will be under 25 years of age. At present only one in seven is in this category. This too represents a challenge.

Every one of these young people should have his chance to measure up to his top capacity for useful work. Discrimination on the basis of race, in regard to both employment and promotion, must go. We can't afford the cost in delinquency and crime which results when talent is frustrated and opportunity is denied.

By 1970, the number of Negro and Puerto Rican workers in our city and State will have substantially increased. According to our projection for New York City, these groups will account for almost 3 out of every 10 workers within 8 years' time. It is in our common interest to see that these new workers are not left on the fringes of our economy. To do so is to invite social and economic dangers of major proportion.

6814

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 13

My administration has, I am pleased to say, taken several strides forward to meet our responsibilities. I am sure I need not tell you what we are going to do about minimum wages—\$1.25 now and \$1.50 1 year from now. And we will have the broadest coverage under any minimum wage law on any statute books anywhere in the country. By thus elevating our wage minimum, we shall be attacking a root cause of misery, crime, and injustice. In this attack, we must succeed.

In this city we believe in the right of collective bargaining. We put our beliefs into action. Under an executive order of mine which has earned the title of "Little Wagner Act," we guarantee to more than 100,000 employees of city agencies directly under the mayor's jurisdiction the right to organize and bargain collectively. Thousands of city workers have availed themselves of the right and now enjoy the benefits of union representation.

Nor do we willingly tolerate abuses which interfere with the legitimate practice of collective bargaining anywhere within our jurisdiction. Thus, we have just enacted a local law prohibiting the recruitment, transportation, or employment of professional strikebreakers to replace employees who are on strike or locked out.

These are some of the steps which we in New York City have been taking. And I don't see why what is good enough for New York City is not good enough for the rest of the State.

I know that since this is a State convention, you will be giving thought to the actions which can be taken in Albany to achieve a better life for the people of this State. I offer you the example of the city of New York. Consider this program: (1) Establish the \$1.50 minimum wage on a statewide basis in 1963; (2) overhaul the Condon-Wadlin Act; (3) extend the right of collective bargaining to employees of non-profit institutions; and (4) ban the importation and recruitment of strikebreakers.

You might use this program as a test to separate those friends of labor who pay lip-service to the cause from those who are really willing to work for the betterment of the conditions of labor.

I am sure that in any event your deliberations will result in a challenging program—a program keyed to the needs of our times.

Cotton Import Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern with the welfare of the cotton textile industry which is so vital to the economy of my own district and to the national prosperity, I have introduced today two measures which, if enacted, could mean continued survival and growth of a basic manufacturing enterprise, and the stability of numberless jobs of textile workers.

The first of these bills seeks to limit the imports of cotton textiles to the volume imported in 1961—the base year of the short-term Geneva agreement by the major textile-producing nations. The other is a joint resolution which would equalize the competitive positions of foreign and domestic manufacturers of

cotton textiles by imposing an import duty so long as we maintain a cotton export subsidy.

To extend statutory protection to our textile industry and its workers is particularly urgent at this time because of the shocking and unexpected unfavorable decision by the U.S. Tariff Commission on the equalizing fee for cotton imports. Too, one of the principal international agreements for the limitation of foreign textiles into the United States expires September 30. It is to be hoped that a new 5-year agreement will be reached before the end of this month, but there is no certainty that it will be done, I am informed.

But even if a new Geneva agreement for a longer term than the present 1-year agreement is reached, the textile industry of this country needs the stabilizing influence which statutory protection would bring. It would certainly encourage modernization and expansion, and it would act as an insurance against fluctuating rates of imports of foreign textiles. The President has assured the industry that he intends to keep the import rate at 6 percent, but it has been at 8 percent during the term of the present agreement.

The American textile industry is and will be at a great disadvantage as long as it must pay high support prices for American raw cotton which foreign manufacturers can obtain for 8½ cents a pound less. This price advantage, coupled with lower wages and often lower taxes, provides a ruinous competitive position for our domestic industry.

This session of Congress approaches adjournment, and if there is no protection available against a flood of cheaply produced foreign cotton products, our own industry faces a highly inequitable and dangerous position in its home market.

The textile mills of the Far East, Europe, and the Middle East are among the world's most modern. In many if not most instances, this modernization has been made possible through American aid. To now deny the American textile industry a measure of protection while it modernizes to meet outside competition would be, in my opinion, exceedingly shortsighted and economically disastrous.

There is, as you know, now a case before the Office of Emergency Planning, in which it is sought to have the textile industry declared vital and necessary to the national security. If such a finding is made, the President would then have the authority to take measures to protect the domestic textile industry just as the mandatory oil imports program is operating to protect, to some extent, the domestic petroleum industry. I have no assurance, of course, when and if the Office of Emergency Planning will make such a finding. Meantime there is little outside of the prospective international agreements which offer the prospect of a reasonable amount of protection.

If statutory protection for the textile industry is not provided by this Congress, it might well be 2 years before such legislation could be made effective. Such a period would prove catastrophic to our

domestic textile manufacturers if the flow of foreign cotton products is not otherwise stemmed.

There have been other important segments of American industry which have been threatened by ruinous foreign competition arising from inequities in production costs and failure to impose reasonable and adequate limitations on imports. Some of those industries have not survived.

I think none would seriously debate that the great textile industry is vital to the economic health and the security of the United States. The time to insure its continued existence and to aid toward permanent health and growth is now.

Kennedy Do-Nothing Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for the American people to understand why Mr. Kennedy refuses to face the facts on Cuba. Everyone else in the United States seems to realize that the shipments of military men and material to Cuba are a danger to our national security. Our President fumbles about and says he has no indication that these arms are going to be used offensively. Since when did the Communist stop his offensive?

In yesterday's New York Herald Tribune both Roscoe Drummond and David Lawrence elaborated on Kennedy's appeasement of Cuban communism:

THE BASIC ONE DESCRIBED: MONROE DOCTRINE BROKEN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If we are to have a fair chance of lifting Soviet rule—not just Castro rule—from the backs of the Cuban people, the first thing we must do is face the facts.

We are not doing so yet. There is a dangerous tendency to blur the facts in order to avoid facing the consequences instead of looking the facts head on in order to deal with them.

Let me illustrate.

President Kennedy says that "the gravest issues would arise" if Cuba provided Russia with a "military base."

Can anyone seriously question that all of Cuba is today a base of Soviet power and that Moscow will determine how that power will be used? The fact is that the "gravest issues," which the President suggests "would arise" if something happened in the future, have already risen. It has happened. To assume that these "grave issues" lie ahead is, it seems to me, the most perilously wishful thinking. They are here now.

THEORY IS ASSAILED

A number of officials are taking comfort from the theory that, in their view, the massive flow of weapons the Soviet Union is pouring into Cuba does not show "any significant offensive capability."

Can anyone seriously argue that Soviet control of Castro's Cuba does not confront us with "the gravest issues" now because the Soviet weapons do not yet look "significantly offensive"? The fact is that the "gravest issues" are upon us.

To be comforted by the theory that the current flow of Soviet weaponry into Cuba seems to be mostly defensive—a defense against the Cuban people?—is to ignore the meaning of what is happening. The significant fact is that Mr. Khrushchev is now in charge of Cuba. If we blink at this fact and wait until his weapons are pointed at Cuba's neighbors, not just at the Cuban people, then we are neglecting the danger.

"To pretend otherwise," writes Washington Commentator Robert G. Spivack—and I believe he is profoundly right—"is to underestimate the dimensions of Soviet ambition, to misread Communist history and delude ourselves about the potential of the Alliance for Progress."

All this easy talk about the Monroe Doctrine and how the United States is just as determined to implement it as ever is buncombe. The commitment of the Monroe Doctrine is that no non-American power should be allowed to colonize or obtain control anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. The fact is that under the statutes of the Organization of American States, the United States while as committed as ever to the purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, has struck from its own hands any certain means of applying it. The guarantee against "foreign intervention" in the Western Hemisphere no longer rests upon the unilateral power of the United States. It has been made the commitment of the 22 American member states—with the proviso that it can be brought into being only by a two-thirds vote of all the governments.

How, then, can we say that the Monroe Doctrine is being used to shield the Western Hemisphere from foreign intervention when there is no means of invoking it without a two-thirds vote by the Organization of American States? People say it by pretending that the facts are different than they are. They say that the Monroe Doctrine will be assuredly invoked if Khrushchev's Cuba turns its guns against any other American state or even threatens to do so.

THE CLEAR PRINCIPLE

How escapist can we get? The clear, undeviating, historic principle of the Monroe Doctrine is that it was to protect against the setting up of a foreign power anywhere on the two continents, not to wait until a foreign power had acquired a hemisphere stronghold and then try to shield the rest from the consequences.

What are the facts? The facts are that the Castro regime now rests on Soviet guns aimed at the Cuban people by Soviet direction. Cuba is today a Soviet satellite as East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia are Soviet satellites. Castro has as much to say about his country—and what is to be done with it—as Ulbricht about East Germany.

The fact is that the Monroe Doctrine has been successfully breached, and many are still talking as though the gravest issues were somewhere in the future, not in the urgent present.

SOVIETS MAKE CUBAN HAY WHILE THE UNITED STATES DOES NOTHING (By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 2 weeks have passed since the news was given out that the Soviets had begun an arms buildup in Cuba. The United States so far as known has sent no protest to the Soviet Government against its flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Government has taken advantage of America's silence and has filled the broadcast waves of the world with one propaganda blast after the other, characterizing President Kennedy's callup of Reserves as a provocative action. The latest accusation actually turns the tables on the United States and warns the Wash-

ington Government that it must not do anything in Cuba to interfere with the Castro government's policy of acquiring Soviet arms. The claim is reiterated that Cuba is arming for defense. President Kennedy thus has given away a propaganda advantage by appearing to accept the Castro and Soviet arguments that the supplying of arms and the sending of "technicians" are simply for "defensive" purposes.

It is a puzzle just why Mr. Kennedy hoooes to forfeit the initiative in propaganda. Time was when the American Government uttered its protests through formal diplomatic channels and made them public in situations comparable to the present controversy over the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The action of the Moscow government not only affects the Monroe Doctrine as a policy but is directly related to America's own security. To place missile pads and missiles in Cuba, which is just 90 miles away from our own shores, is an act that can be construed as hostile to the United States. Yet the administration prefers to say nothing by way of formal protest.

ADMINISTRATION FEARS

The seriousness of the situation is not diminished but actually increased by the failure to make any protest before the world. Unfortunately, the Soviets may come to believe that they have successfully bluffed the United States into silence and they may take further chances in the cold war. Moscow in its latest outburst even hints at a nuclear war if the United States does anything about Cuba.

The impression in Washington is that the administration has all along been afraid of "increasing tensions" by saying anything to Russia about the Cuban buildup. Still, the Soviets do not mind increasing tensions by their propaganda statements. These could be regarded as of little importance if they were merely part of an exchange of words between the Soviet Union and the United States. Unhappily, the propaganda is circulated all over the world. The peoples of allied as well as neutral countries can thus be influenced to believe that the United States is afraid to speak out and is being shoved into a corner by the aggressive pronouncements of the Soviet Union.

The administration has known for a long time about the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba. On September 2, United Press International in a dispatch from Washington said:

"A State Department spokesman said today that the Soviet announcement of arms aid to Cuba 'merely confirms what has been going on in recent months.' The spokesman said:

"The announcement doesn't seem to represent anything new. We've been saying right along that the Soviet Union has been sending military equipment and technicians to Cuba."

But the American people were not told officially about this until about 2 weeks ago and there is no public record that the United States has filed any protest with the Soviet Government concerning the arms building. Naturally, the Soviets would construe this as an acquiescence and would be inclined to increase their military buildup in Cuba and begin to send arms to other parts of Latin America which they are planning to infiltrate through agents already on the job.

THURMOND COMMENT

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, Democrat, referring to some of Mr. Kennedy's recent statements, said the other day in the Senate:

"The President's comments indicate strongly that the Monroe Doctrine has recently been reinterpreted with major omissions to the extent that the Monroe Doctrine is no longer a bulwark of U.S. foreign policy which it was for over 100 years."

In Congress, Members of both parties are restive and uneasy about the apparent surrender of the initiative to the Soviet Union. Authority to call up 150,000 reserves has been overwhelmingly endorsed, but this does not overcome the feeling in Congress that the United States is being portrayed over the airwaves as afraid to stand up to the Soviets. Paul Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, in a television interview over the ABC network Sunday, really summed up the situation. He wasn't trying to be critical of the administration and, in fact, was endeavoring to defend it. But he unwittingly stated the case against the administration's policy of silence when he said:

"I think the grounds for concern are, first of all, that this assistance the Soviets are giving Castro makes it more difficult for the Cuban people ever to restore their freedom and, secondly, this helps Castro consolidate his position in Cuba and thereby might increase the possibility that Cuba could be used as a base for Communist infiltration into the rest of the hemisphere."

Yet nothing has been said officially for the last several months to the Soviet Government in protest about all this.

How To Save Your Life on the Most Dangerous Weekend of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD another timely and wonderful article by our great U.S. Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges. I had the pleasure of putting another one of his great articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which goes to every part of our beloved Nation, and have had so many wonderful letters from every end of the country congratulating us on what Secretary Hodges had to say in his article.

It seems to me that this article is even greater than the last one, and I believe all of us appreciate the great work that Secretary Hodges has done, is doing and will continue to do in the Cabinet of President Kennedy. Secretary Hodges is just a genius in so many ways. He has brains and ability and such an understanding heart, and you will always find him, in my judgment, doing the things that will help all mankind. This article was a timely warning and we know now, since the Labor Day has passed and we have the record, that it was the most dangerous weekend of the year.

God bless Luther Hodges and give him strength to carry on the great work he is doing for this great Nation as Secretary of Commerce.

The article follows:

HOW TO SAVE YOUR LIFE ON THE MOST DANGEROUS WEEKEND OF THE YEAR

(By Luther H. Hodges)

I am addressing this article to you, Mr. and Mrs. Motorist, in the hope that you will not be among the thousands killed or injured next weekend.

A6816

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September

All signs point to the fact that Labor Day 1962 could be the worst holiday for traffic deaths in the history of the United States. That's the grim assessment of our U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, which recently completed a study of accident records. Over the years, it was discovered, Labor Day weekend has been the most dangerous holiday of all.

This year's Labor Day is even more ominous because it will be the only long holiday weekend in 1962. Every other major holiday falls in midweek. That means thousands of Americans—perhaps you too—have been waiting all summer for Labor Day to hit the highways.

As Chairman of President Kennedy's new Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, I've been directed to throw the full weight of the Government's scientific and engineering resources into reducing the staggering annual totals of auto deaths.

DRIVER REGISTER STARTED

We're working, for example, to build into the great new Interstate Highway System lifesaving features that will prevent 2,000 deaths in 1962 alone. And we've started a driver register, a permanent list of drivers whose licenses have been revoked. If a violator tries to get a license in another State, authorities can ask us for his record and act accordingly.

We're sure these new programs will help. But in the last analysis, safety is still your job. You and your fellow motorists are the only ones who can reduce the number of Americans killed and injured next weekend—now predicted at 60,000.

To help you help yourself, we have selected the following 10 watchwords for safety from the research findings of the Bureau of Public Roads. These are the most important things to do. Read them; check yourself against them. Then use them on the road this weekend.

Before you start:

1. Safety-check your car. At the very least, make sure your tires, brakes, and lights are fully serviceable. I've put safety belts in my own car, and advise everyone to do so.

2. Plan your trip. Get good maps and information; lay out your trip thoughtfully. Estimate realistically how far you can go each day by staying within the speed limits. Plan to drive not more than 8 hours a day; if that is impossible, include plenty of rest stops.

3. Safety-check yourself. Too often drivers take better care of the car than themselves. They'll run themselves ragged trying to clear everything up at the office and at home, staying up much too late the night before leaving.

While en route:

4. Stay alert. Some tips: eat lightly so you don't become drowsy. Abstain completely from alcohol at least until you've stopped driving for the day. Stop periodically to stretch your legs.

5. Obey the speed laws. Serious accidents increase drastically at speeds above 65 miles per hour. High speeds pay off poorly for the risk involved. On the New Jersey Turnpike, for example, you can observe the legal limit of 60 and travel its length in 118 minutes. If you gamble and go 70 the most you'll save is just 17 minutes.

6. Use judgment. The law sets limits, but within those limits you have to use common sense. On a good, dry, 60-mile-per-hour highway, for instance, driving at less than 40 is actually dangerous. But on a wet road at night, you should stay under the legal speed.

7. Make courtesy a habit. Psychological studies show that accident repeaters tend to be overly aggressive. Don't work off your tension on the highway. You'd do better to tell off your boss—it could cost you your job, but not your life.

8. Exercise self-control. We all know the "big George" type of driver who weaves in and out of line, cussing everyone else on the road. Remember you're traveling for enjoyment. Relax.

9. Communicate. We must cooperate with other drivers to stay alive. Let the fellow behind know what you're going to do. Use all four kinds of signals—not just left turn or right turn, but "slow down" and "pass me." If your car breaks down, warn other drivers by tying a handkerchief on the traffic side of the car or, at night, keeping dome and tail lights on.

10. Be imaginative. Imagine yourself in that other car in the next lane, for example. Think what you would do if you were its driver, and guide your own car accordingly. Of course, you can't anticipate everything; expect the unsuspected and be ready to act promptly.

Every driver can and should add items to this list. But I guarantee that if each of us concentrate on these 10, we'll soon make a change in the present intolerable situation, where it's at least 50 percent more dangerous to drive a car than to ride an airliner, where almost 5 million people are injured each year—equal to the combined population of Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

Labor Day is a time to work for safety. Let's put these 10 watchwords into practice then—and every other day too.

Edward E. Ting, Native American of Chinese Ancestry, Flees 13 Years of Captivity in Red China Through Aid and Assistance of High School Classmate, Samuel L. Cutler, of Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are fully aware of the profound gratification that comes to a Member of Congress upon the successful resolution of casework, particularly those cases we handle involving human beings. I had such an experience recently when a native American of Chinese ancestry, Mr. Edward E. Ting, who grew up in my home city of Springfield, Mass., managed to flee from his Communist Chinese captors after living for 13 years in mainland China under Red oppression. I had worked for several years on this case with Mr. Ting's high school classmate, Mr. Samuel L. Cutler, of Springfield, in an effort to establish Mr. Ting's American citizenship and the fact that he had been issued an American passport to travel to China in 1928. Mr. Cutler is to be commended for his dedication and persistence in trying to help out his old boyhood friend, and his devotion to this cause has paid off for Mr. Ting is now back living in Springfield in Mr. Cutler's household.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert with my remarks the very moving human interest story by Foster L. Spencer that appeared in the Springfield Republican, August 26, concerning the

flight to freedom from Red China by Mr. Ting:

TECH HIGH GRAD IS HOME AFTER FLEEING RED CHINA—EDWARD E. TING REUNITED WITH BOYHOOD PAL WHO HELPED FREE HIM FROM TYRANNY

(By Foster L. Spencer)

"I learned in my college days that he who holds your money, holds your freedom; and whoever holds your food, holds your life. Well, my money and food were held for more than a decade by the rulers of that Red hell."

So said Edward E. Ting, a former Springfield resident and Technical High School graduate, who arrived in this city just recently after 35 years in China, the past 13 of those years in what he aptly calls a "Red hell." Mr. Ting arrived safely in the United States from Hong Kong, after a harrowing and dramatic escape from the Communist-held land behind the Bamboo Curtain.

AT CUTLER HOME

Now again in the land of the free, this Chinese-American is staying at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel L. Cutler, 79 Eckington Street. Mr. Cutler, a teacher at Technical High School and a close friend of Mr. Ting during their high school days here, is the man most responsible for Ting's return to the United States. Ever since the Communist takeover in China, Mr. Cutler has made continuous efforts, to get his high school chum out of China. And his unflinching perseverance was duly rewarded when Mr. Ting arrived in Springfield via bus on August 9.

Mr. Ting's story is one of resolute determination and bravery in the face of deprivation, starvation, tyranny and death. But today, at age 61, Mr. Ting actually is living a dream which taunted him for many years when he worked 16 hours a day at forced labor in Red China.

AGAIN IN PARADISE

"I'm once again in paradise," was Mr. Ting's comment on his safe arrival in the United States after enduring incomparable hardships at the hands of the militant, ruthless Red tyranny.

But let Mr. Ting tell his story—a story which needs to be told to freedom-loving people everywhere. It's a dramatic and heart-rending story—but more important—it is a firsthand report by an American citizen about a land where Americans have been forbidden.

ESCAPE FROM RED CHINA

"Repeatedly since the Communists consolidated their position in China, I made application to leave the country for Hong Kong or Macao. I first applied for permission to leave when I was a civil engineer with the Canton and Hankow railroad, stationed at Hung Yang in 1950. My application was denied and so were succeeding applications, until I was finally notified by the Red bureaucracy that a person must be at a port city in order to emigrate."

Grew old

"When I learned that I must go to a seaport to apply for emigration, I knew that I wouldn't be permitted to leave Hung Yang without some excuse.

"It was then I decided to 'grow old.' I grew a long beard, wore a long, drab, black habit, carried a cane and crept around while at work. I luckily developed arthritis in one hand as time went on. After I had let myself appear sufficiently old and useless to the Communist bosses, I asked permission to leave for the seaport of Canton, where I said I knew a doctor who could help cure me. This was over 2 years ago—in 1960.

"The authorities eventually allowed my request, and I left for Canton, where I immediately petitioned to leave the country. I was told that I must establish residence in

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18265

maintain the peace? Second, can we contain communism?

And now, today, we are going to talk about the third great issue or challenge: Can we maintain this country economically healthy? Or, in other words, can we maintain a sound economic system? Of course, we cannot do that if war should come, nor would we be able to do it if we were taken over by the Communists. So we have got to make sure that we win the two previous issues.

Now the third one is most important, and calls for the best thinking of all Americans.

The cold war still continues. The demands on us to make our contribution to contain war from erupting in other places, plus the tremendous cost of being adequately prepared, required upward of \$50 billion or more. Now, as someone has said, "that's not peanuts." Then, beside that item we have the interest on our national debt, our veterans pensions, the overseas cost of Government, and so forth, and so we get up to a total close to a yearly need of \$100 billion.

Of course, we are a nation of 186 million people. We have within our borders half of the market of the world, but we also are faced with tremendous challenges that we did not have a few years ago. I mean foreign competition. With our Marshall plan, and other aids, we have built up the manufacturing plants of other nations where labor is cheaper. We have now got to see that the markets of America are not flooded with these foreign goods. At the same time, we have got to maintain our export-import trade, which provides quite a problem.

Then, of course, the farm program is with us. During the war we said to the farmers, "Produce, so we can feed the world." And they did. Now, we have surpluses in practically everything that the farmer produces. How to handle that problem has not yet been solved.

We cannot ignore the fact, either, in considering our economic welfare, the turbulence in the new nations, where the people are just coming out of their sleep. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that just off our shore is Cuba, which is a Communist satellite, and China, with its more than half a billion searching, seeking human beings which Mao Tse-tung may cause to erupt at any time.

Now, let us discuss the meaning of a sound economic system—bearing in mind we must keep the free enterprise system intact, and not let state socialism take over our system.

Besides protecting our economic philosophy, we have our political system to preserve. I mean the great freedoms that we are trustees of. The Communists have no appreciation of these jewels of great price. Yet, in some of the Communist countries the yeast is in ferment.

The goal of maintaining a sound economic system is, as a goal, something none of us will argue about. We know that a sound economic system is absolutely indispensable to the welfare of our own people and the peace of the world. But there are, in my opinion, two

aspects of this subject that will merit some discussion:

First. A brief consideration of what constitutes a sound economic system; and

Second. Some guidelines as to what we, as a nation, must do to assure that we will continue to have a sound economy.

We can start by recognizing that the main function of any economic system is to permit the optimum satisfaction of man's physical and, yes, his spiritual needs as well. With this criterion, we must agree that our American economy has over the years performed with remarkable effectiveness. When we consider the fantastically involved complex that our economy has grown into, and how it usually performs its myriad functions with minimal friction, we may rightfully have great pride and faith in it.

We hear a great deal about the growing intervention of the Government into the affairs of businessmen and the decline of individual freedom. I do not deny some element of truth in this charge. But let us also remember that the overwhelming day-to-day economic decisions are those made freely and without governmental coercion by all of us as producers and consumers of the goods and services needed by over 186 million Americans. In no other land does the economic system function with as much freedom of choice as in America. Despite the growing powers of government, of big business, and of organized labor, it is still the consumers of America who in their freedom of basic choices play a pivotal role in the economic process.

I, of course, do not mean to suggest that we should complacently accept our economic system as it is, even though it is basically superior for us to all alternative systems. Each of you will have no difficulty in pointing to areas where change, change for the better, is urgent. And to strive for such improvements, promptly and with vigor, is necessary if we are to preserve that freedom of choice and the freedom of action in our economy as we know it.

When we talk about a sound economic system, we clearly mean to reject any thought that such a system can be static or rigidly fixed. We must focus our attention on an economy that grows as the needs of the Nation and its people grow. I do not intend to get into the idly speculative game of percentages of economic growth and whether we should or should not have a rate of growth greater than that of Britain or Germany or Russia. There are so many ways of measuring economic growth, and the rate of growth is so dependent on the base period from which the rate of growth is measured, that any single percentage figure, such as a growth rate of 3 percent a year, is rather meaningless.

Furthermore, there is no merit in growth just for the sake of growth, any more than sound reason to keep on inflating a balloon higher and higher. We want not just economic growth, but that particular kind of economic growth that is needed to cope with our growing

population, our technological advances, our expanding needs. We want the right kind of economic growth because we know that our Nation will be stunted and stifled if we permit our human resources to lie idle and fail to harness the talents and imagination of our people to the goals we cherish.

Thus, perhaps the paramount economic need of the Nation today is to take steps to solve the nagging problem of excessive unemployment in today's labor force. As Senators know, in the past 8 years, the rate of unemployment, even at the peak of the business cycle, has been creeping up. Today, after a steady improvement in most economic indicators over the past 16 months, unemployment—seasonally adjusted—is still, as of June 1962, 5.5 percent of the civilian labor force. It went down to a low of 4.9 percent in February 1960 and even further to a low of 3.9 percent in March and April of 1957.

There are, of course, many reasons which have been given to explain this disturbing trend. Many believe that the rapid advances in automation and other technological developments have cut so sharply into the employment of major industries as to more than offset increasing employment in other, newer industries. The relative satiation of consumer demand for many durable goods that were in exceedingly short supply at the end of World War II, coupled with a slacking of investment in production facilities for such items, is also considered a major factor. In some industries, such as coal and iron ore, depletion of resources combined with high labor costs, has caused serious unemployment. In certain industries rising imports have been a factor.

Thus, it is obvious that there can be no single, and no simple, solution to the exasperatingly persistent unemployment phenomenon that confronts us today. But there are certain basic approaches that may help us in thinking about the problem. First, we can stand on the basic premise that the primary responsibility for the employment of America's potential workers rests with the businessmen of this country. The American businessman has throughout our history shown great resourcefulness in providing consumers, directly and indirectly, with the goods and services they call for, and, as we know, through the many media of advertising has done much to stimulate and magnify such demand. They have, as a result, been the motivating force behind the employment of American workers and will continue to be so.

But it is clear that there must be a reasonable prospect of profitable operations before an enterprising businessman will invest in plant, buy materials, and hire labor for expanding production. And it is precisely in this area that the Government shares responsibility with private enterprise. It has always been the function of Government, now as much as ever, to assure business of a so-called economic climate in which the profit motive has a fair chance of operation. Thus the entire fiscal program

of the Government is immediately involved. We think of the tax burden which individuals and corporations have to bear. There is no doubt in my mind that substantial changes in our tax structure are called for. Not only has the tax structure been modified piecemeal again and again over the past decades, resulting in many complications and inequities, but the entire tax burden is now so high, on both corporations and individuals, as to raise serious concern as to its effect on the economy.

It is quite possible that incentives for business investments may have been already affected. I am in accord with the President's pledge of August 13 to reduce tax rates in January, but I am not entirely convinced that an earlier tax cut might not be more desirable to stimulate both consumption and investment before a possible downturn in the economy reaches such proportions that more drastic cuts may prove necessary.

The new depreciation schedules issued last month by the Treasury Department should, in themselves, provide some stimulus to investment, with further impetus to be provided by the investment credit bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee. However, I believe it important to recognize that tax cuts should be geared to the stimulation of both consumption and investment. It is idle to stimulate investment alone, unless such investment will be shortly transformed into higher levels of consumption. And, notably in the lower income brackets, any increases in disposable income resulting from a reduction in personal income taxes can be expected to be transformed almost wholly into spending for immediate consumption.

The amount the Government takes in taxes is, of course, important to businessmen and consumers alike. But no less important are the expenditures of Government, and that includes State and local as well as Federal expenditures. Too often these expenditures are viewed in almost completely negative terms, in terms of what they drain out of the private economy. We too easily forget that they contribute much to the economy as well.

The largest segment of public expenditures goes, as Senators are well aware, for national defense purposes. Although there will always be controversy as to the relative merits of various military weapons and military strategy, we will all agree that unless our Nation is protected from potential aggression, economic freedom and a sound economic system become little more than a hollow shell or a distant dream. We want our defense dollars spent wisely, but we know that upon this defense rests our hopes for our chosen way of life, for survival itself.

Many, if not most, other public expenditures are intended in one way and another, to help provide particular benefits to our people, benefits which are not, or cannot be as readily provided by private enterprise. Here again, we will find opposition to the farm program, to the highway program, to proposed programs of aid to the aged, but in each case, the people, through their elected representatives, have determined that the Govern-

ment is in a position to promote or protect essential activities in the national economy with greater effectiveness than other groups. So we have a Federal farm program to help assure farmers of adequate income; a highway program to facilitate movement of people and goods by motorists, public and private truckers, and buses; and Federal assistance to the aged.

Thus far, I have spoken of how the Government can help private business solve the unemployment problem by providing, in various ways, a more favorable economic climate that will encourage the expansion of business and therewith the employment of more workers. I have thus dealt with stimulating the demand for labor. We should also take a few minutes to look at the supply of labor, because part of the answer to the unemployment problem, particularly in the long run, lies in the abilities of those in and those coming into the labor market. This phase of the unemployment problem is currently crystallized when we contrast the disturbing unemployment figures I cited with the fact that our major newspapers contain page after page of help wanted advertisements, but advertisements almost entirely for engineers, physicists, designers, sales executives, computer programmers, and other highly skilled personnel. We have unemployed miners, but a crying shortage of engineers. Textile and leather workers are pounding the pavements, but we have far too few doctors, nurses, and teachers.

This points to an educational crisis that is becoming more serious every year. Here, too, the solution is not solely a matter of private or of public concern. Businessmen will undoubtedly accelerate the training programs offered by many concerns in the major industries of the country. Private schools, training centers, colleges, and universities will certainly expand.

But there is little question that the major responsibility for a citizenry trained to meet the vocational needs of tomorrow will be in the hands of our public school systems throughout the Nation.

The problem of adequate schools and colleges is doubly acute due both to the rapid acceleration in the number of school and college age boys and girls, and to the more advanced training some of it requiring expensive laboratory and other equipment, which the needs of today's and tomorrow's technology and economy make essential. It is this need which must receive the highest of priorities among public officials in all levels of government. It deserves the most serious attention of all of us as private citizens.

It is a familiar economic axiom, that while man's resources are limited, his needs and desires are virtually limitless, in any case far outstripping the resources, natural and human, available for filling these needs. We must make choices. We must decide as citizens what we shall insist on and what we will do without. One thing we cannot do without is adequate educational opportunities for our children, and not just

for our children, but for all of us, those wishing to learn a new trade and those who want to continue to expand their intellectual and social horizons. This will keep taxes, especially State and local taxes up. But I can think of few dollars that are more important than those that help provide more and better teachers and educational facilities.

I have sketched for Senators a few of my thoughts on what we need to do to assure ourselves of a sound economic system in the years ahead. It is a task that all of us share. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government to see that private enterprise has the opportunity to function freely and fairly. But it is even more important for private enterprise to take advantage of its rights and potential to provide the goods and services we and our country require.

Finally, we should recognize that we should never consider a sound economic system as a final goal in itself. An economic system exists solely to serve the needs of the people. A sound economic system will help us to maintain peace. It will help us in our dealings with other peoples of the world. It will make possible greater understanding and appreciation of the myriad talents and interests of our own people. It is an indispensable tool for progress. But it can never take the place of spirit of liberty, of patriotism, of human sympathy and understanding, which is the essence of worthwhile living here and now.

Cuba U.S. HUSH-HUSH GIVES REDS TIME TO SET UP BASE IN CUBA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Reporter, a weekly newspaper which will soon be converted into a daily newspaper, is attracting much attention as a new newspaper. Particularly interesting have been the special reports by Mr. Edward Hunter, the author of a number of books on Communist brainwashing techniques. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Hunter printed on the front page of the Milwaukee Reporter entitled "U.S. Hush-Hush Gives Reds Time To Set Up Base in Cuba" on September 7, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. HUSH-HUSH GIVES REDS TIME TO SET UP BASE IN CUBA

(By Edward Hunter)

WASHINGTON.—The same hush-hush that provided Fidel Castro with the protection he needed to capture Cuba for the Reds is now giving Moscow the time to make a base for space war out of Cuba. In both instances, this protection was provided by the State Department.

Whatever the motivation, Red success in this maneuver can make American defense in decisive space war practically impossible.

The recent Communist success in placing two manned satellites close to each other in the heavens was a military measure, closely linked to the mission given the Red technicians sent to Cuba by the Soviet bloc.

Destruction of a rocket in orbital flight does not require contact between it and another rocket. The destroyer does not have to come any closer than the second spaceship sent up by the Communist Russians

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18267

came to their first one, if Soviet claims are anywhere near accurate on this point. Even if not, they came near enough in the present stage of military preparation.

Both of those rockets were sent up by the Kremlin, which maintained them under its constant control. The problem the Reds face in confronting the American defense program is that the Kremlin would not know the exact details of orbit by our sky vehicle.

That is, if the Reds do not have espionage agents to handle this part of the maneuver for them. We certainly know they make every effort under such circumstances to plant such agents. Our hush-hush on inquiry into communism in the United States, and official discouragement of anti-Communist activity, can only help them repeat their previous successes as in the theft of our A-bomb specifications.

A satellite tracking station in Cuba would give the Moscow-Peiping axis exactly what it needs to counter American retaliation for an attack. Precise data is required on the initial flight path of a satellite.

The Cuban tracking station could obtain this for the Reds, letting Moscow know at once. Exactly as the second spaceship it sent up came close to the first one, a rocket could be dispatched, with or without being manned, to go close enough to one of ours to destroy it, or at least to push it off its track. This would be equivalent to shoving a pistol off target.

Rocket ships are so delicate that only a slight reverberation is required in space to send it onto a different path, off target.

Moscow's whole military strategy for aggression is built around the knowledge it obtains from us, of our developments and actions, and our announced policy of never striking the initial blow, but sitting back and waiting to be hit first, with all the enemy can throw at us.

FIRST BLOW IN GAMES

Perhaps in harmless children's games, one permits a first blow to be landed, but not in any fight for keeps, that is, if one seeks survival and victory, and isn't distracted by a fantastic no-win policy. The probable enemy has to be let known without any doubt that he would never be given an opportunity to land an initial blow, certainly not with possibly decisive weapons, but that the moment he tried, he'd be reeling, himself, from attack. This isn't belligerency.

Such a sane approach would require much more realism in our intelligence services. Isn't this what they were set up for? What else can be anywhere nearly as important as data on such matters?

But exactly as we let the Communists know a dozen years ago, that we were depriving South Korea of sufficient weapons to defend itself, thereby inevitably bringing on the Korean war, the Reds have been invited to design their war strategy on the basis of our declaration that we will take the first blow.

All the Communist war machine has to plan, therefore, is to make any American retaliatory blow ineffective. Hence the significance of Cuba in the Red military planning by Khrushchev and his coexistence conspirators.

If the Kremlin can find out at once about any retaliatory blow that we might attempt, it would have the advantage it needed for victory. A satellite tracking station in Cuba would go far to provide just this strategic military information.

The flow of Communist military technicians into Cuba is directly connected with this program of the Peiping-Moscow axis. While Cuba's Red bosses have frankly declared they intend to help in every possible way to bring about the destruction of the United States, we officially go on the premise that it is a friendly country, and that our

relations to it are bound by neutrality provisions.

This is "asking for it" in colloquial language. Will we never learn, until it is too late?

TECHNICIANS MILITARY MEN

President Kennedy used double-talk in his press conference when he was asked about the reports that Communist troops from East Europe had been brought into Cuba. He said, No, there was no evidence that they were troops. Yet he knew, and so do many in Washington, that this reply was misleading, because the technicians are mostly military men. The modern military officer is primarily a technician. They had been sent into Cuba for military preparations, not to build sugar mills.

Consistently, for several administrations, the American public has been deceived in this semantic manner as to the true world situation. Censorship is now being used against the American people, not as it traditionally was in the past, to keep the enemy from knowing security matters. This was proven by the testimony in the recent Senate hearings on the gagging of Pentagon officers. A subtle change has been imposed, without permission of Congress, or the knowledge of the American people.

This has gone hand in hand with the development of an anti-anti-Communist policy in so-called prestige newspapers, that collaborate in such distortion and suppression of the news. This is the primary danger in a one-ownership press in any important community in our land, irrespective of the political leanings of the proprietorship. This is why we had a traditional check-and-balance, competitive system, now being destroyed simultaneously with the rise of a new political approach, falsely called liberal, that favors centralization of power in a so-called "elite" in the Nation's Capital.

The American public, understandably worried by such developments as the absorption of Cuba into the Red military network, is being lulled and deceived by the doubletalk by those who have become inflated with power under a government by the elite ideology.

Only Congress, safeguarded by the Constitution, stands against such kidnapping of Government processes. Congress can only fulfill its responsibilities if backed by a determined electorate that will insist on it upholding its constitutional rights. A competitive press is essential for a public to be properly informed to be able to be vigilant and exercise its sovereign powers.

The people are sovereign in the United States, certainly not the appointees in high places in Washington, who act as if they were rulers.

The Monroe Doctrine provides the United States with every right it requires—except the will—to safeguard its existence against the incursion of any foreign ideology into the New World. The threat against us that Maximilian posed in Mexico in 1864 was nothing compared to the peril in which we have been placed by the incursion of international communism into Cuba.

MONROE DOCTRINE IGNORED

The Monroe Doctrine was tossed into the scrap heap of history by Washington bigwigs not too long ago. They were so world minded they forgot about America's safety. At President Kennedy's press conference of August 29, when he was asked several times about Cuba, and finally specifically about the Monroe Doctrine, his answer was weak-kneed and misleading, one of those "interpretations" that replace aboveboard speech in the Nation's Capital nowadays.

The traditional American position regarding the Monroe Doctrine, until the State Department's so-called lower echelons perverted it, has been as definite as anything has ever been in our national life. We did not allow

foreign ideology to move into the Americas, supported by foreign power, because this constituted a danger to American survival. This was the Monroe Doctrine.

President Kennedy answered yes, the Monroe Doctrine still meant what it always did—nobody denies this—and then, as an example, said that we were working in the Organization of American States "to isolate the Communist menace in Cuba." This is not how the Monroe Doctrine is supposed to operate. It is not an alliance, it is U.S. policy.

EXTENDING RESPONSIBILITY

This is extending the responsibility, which has always been our own, to others. We wonder, with such displays of weakness, why these others then refuse to accept the responsibility we no longer accept.

Data in the offices of a number of Congressmen and Senators in Washington has provided firsthand information on the abrogation in Cuba of the Monroe Doctrine, and the establishment of a foreign-armed, foreign-run military force in that island neighbor. The same suppressions are now imposed on the Cuban people as are inflicted against the East Germans, where they are made visible for all the world by the wall of shame. The shame is ours in letting it rise, for on the side of the Reds, the wall constitutes a defiance, demonstrating power and the will to employ it, with utter disregard of human rights.

If anything will bring war and destruction to the American people, it will be a continuation of hush-hush and distortion in information allowed to reach them on such fundamental matters as the creation of a Red military base out of Cuba.

The American people can be trusted to maintain a rational balance in what they expect of our leaders, and to be willing to accept whatever sacrifice the occasion requires, if provided the truth, without it being clouded over, or distorted, or made into a lie by semantics and doubletalk. This way of trust and frankness in our people, and this way only, can the American public provide their Government with the support and the strength that alone can save us from war and destruction.

Before this can come about, the "government of the elite" mentality must be erased from our political minds in Washington.

THE CARACAS RESOLUTION OF 1954 AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. President, earlier today the well-read and well-informed columnist Arthur Krock published an article which I think is extremely pertinent to the discussion about the Monroe Doctrine and the Caracas resolution of 1954. Mr. Krock points out clearly and conclusively that it is still the right of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, unilaterally if necessary.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CARACAS RESOLUTION OF 1954 AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—For some time now, beginning with the indispensable U.S. support of the U.N. military offensive against Katanga as required to preserve international peace, a certain phrase has been reiterated by officials of the Kennedy administration with an air of confidence that the words justify every foreign policy which

has been under strong critical fire. In addition to the U.S.-U.N. Congo policy of waging peace with the implements of war, these critical targets include two others in particular. They are the failure of the administration to lay before the U.N. Assembly India's violation of the charter by seizure of Goa; and the administration's role in Indonesia's blackmailing operation in Netherlands west New Guinea.

The phrase in constant public use by officials here against critics of these policies is, "Do you want a full-scale nuclear world war?"—the import being that this single alternative is not a matter of judgment but a fact established beyond any shred of doubt. But the Cuban situation has spawned another, and very privately uttered, phrase aimed at those who contend that Soviet Russia has clearly challenged the Monroe Doctrine there. This expression is, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." To make this statement in public would raise a tornado of public protest, would echo a similar appraisal by Premier Khrushchev and controvert President Kennedy's recent reaffirmation of the doctrine. So it is not surprising that the few who say that, and support it with the following arguments, specify they are talking strictly off the record:

1. When the 10th Inter-American Conference of 21 nations met in March 1954 at Caracas, it adopted a resolution urged by Secretary of State Dulles. The principal declaration was that control of the political institutions of any American state by international communism, or any extension of that system to this hemisphere, would constitute a threat to the Pan-American continents, and would be met by immediate consultation and action under existing treaties.

DELEGATING POWER TO OAS

2. The actual and practical effect of this resolution—approved 17 to 1 (Guatemala alone voting "no," Mexico and Argentina abstaining—was to turn over enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine to the Organization of American States as a multilateral proposition. Thereby the United States delegated to the OAS its historic position that it could and would enforce the doctrine unilaterally as before, when in its judgment the extension of a foreign power system to this hemisphere became a matter of fact.

3. Hence, unless and until such an extension was evaluated by the United States as a solid threat to its security, this Nation would abdicate enforcement of the doctrine, and the details of enforcement, to the judgment of the OAS.

4. Consequently, the historic Monroe Doctrine "died" at Caracas in 1954, and the only basis for forceful United States measures toward Cuba is an evaluation by the President that the threat posed there endangers national security.

A supplemental argument advanced for this thesis is that unilateral invocation of the doctrine by the United States would be repudiated by world opinion because of the ring of our military bases and armed forces around the U.S.S.R.

In the very private sessions in which these views have been asserted, they have thus been rebutted:

1. The right of the United States to enforce the Monroe Doctrine unilaterally, if necessary, was not abandoned at Caracas either by implication or by anything said or encouraged as an inference by our representatives there. Secretary Dulles' comment was merely that the resolution adopted "relates to the extension to this hemisphere of the political system of despotic European powers" and made "as international policy" of the Americas "a portion of the Monroe Doctrine which has largely been forgotten." This gives no foundation to the analysis that, when the OAS declines to implement this

policy, the United States has committed itself to do the same.

2. Unlike the infiltration and subversion of Soviet Russia in Cuba, the purpose of this Nation's bases and troops around the periphery of Russia is to prevent the spread of these activities of international communism, not to expand the American governing system.

Any high officials or Members of Congress who may dispute this rebuttal are not likely to do so publicly.

HEALTH CARE TASK FORCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of health care for the aging will continue to come before the Congress until a practical solution is provided. With the percentage of the aging in our population continuing to grow and costs for medical care continuing to rise while their retirement and other incomes remain relatively static, it is obvious that assistance must be forthcoming if these millions of Americans are to get the health care they need.

Many questions were raised in the Senate debate on the Anderson-Javits bill last July, and I have therefore invited a health care task force composed of some of the best minds in our country on this problem to go into the question of the best way to provide health care for our senior citizens. This task force will, it is expected, bring in a report and recommendations seasonably so that we may have the benefit of their thinking early in the next Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the text of my announcement made in New York, September 12; the statement by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming; and the news stories which appeared in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, September 13.

There being no objection, the announcement, statement, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JAVITS ANNOUNCES FORMATION OF MEDICARE TASK FORCE

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS today announced the formation of a task force on health care for the aging to conduct a full-scale study of the Anderson-Javits health care bill in preparation for the 1963 drive for enactment.

The task force is comprised of a group of outstanding health care experts, including two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom and Dr. Arthur Flemming.

Senator JAVITS said the task force will analyze the major objections raised by opponents of the Anderson-Javits bill this year when it was defeated in the Senate by only four votes. He said the task force will seek to determine if the plan is practical and workable, and will recommend any changes it may deem necessary to improve it.

"This task force is nonpolitical and representative of all interested and qualified groups," Senator JAVITS said. "These distinguished leaders have taken on an important job, and I believe their findings will be of enormous benefit to the next Congress. Their investigation will get underway now so that their report can be made known to the public and Congress early in 1963, before Congress is asked again to act on a health care for the aging bill."

Research staffs will be made available for the study by the University of Oregon development fund and New York University

Law School. The study will be financed by individual benefactors.

Mr. Folsom is now director of Eastman Kodak Co.; Dr. Flemming is president of University of Oregon. Other members of the task force are: Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, emeritus professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; Winslow Carlton, New York health consultant; Thomas Tierney, executive vice president, Colorado Hospital Service (Blue Cross), Denver, Colo.; Dr. Vernon W. Lip-pard, dean of Yale Medical School; Dr. Arthur Larson, Duke University, former Director of USIA; Russell A. Nelson, director, Johns Hopkins Hospital; John C. Leslie, vice president, Pan American Airways, and chairman, Committee on Aging, Community Service Society of New York; Dr. James Dixon, president, Antioch College, Ohio; Dr. Russell Lee, Palo Alto Clinic, California; and Hubert Yount, vice president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

Senator JAVITS said the task force will investigate and report on such matters as:

1. Financing the program: Is the social security system the best way?
2. The private sector option: How practical is it? Are its terms workable? Are provisions for eligibility of vendors of health care, and of insurance carriers, sound?
3. Benefits: Are services provided by the bill deliverable?
4. Cost estimates: How valid?

Senator JAVITS said the task force will also study the growth capabilities of the present Kerr-Mills Act as related to health care requirements of the aging.

STATEMENT BY DR. ARTHUR FLEMMING

I am delighted to respond to the request of Senator JAVITS to participate in the work of the health care task force which he has taken the initiative in bringing together. As a result of my experiences as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I am convinced there is a genuine need for the development of a positive program to assist the aged in protecting themselves in advance against the economic hazards of illness.

I feel that the establishment of this task force by Senator JAVITS reflects his continuing determination to provide the leadership in this area that will substitute action for talk. I look forward to working with the distinguished group of experts that have responded affirmatively to his invitation. I sincerely hope that we may be able to come up with findings and recommendations which will be of real help to the next Congress when it once again faces this very important issue.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1962]
AGED-CARE STUDY SET UP BY JAVITS—12 EXPERTS ON HEALTH TO MAKE INDEPENDENT SURVEY

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS announced yesterday that 12 prominent health authorities would make an independent study of the best way to provide medical care for the aged.

He said the study would start with an analysis of objections that killed the Anderson-Javits bill in the Senate, 52 to 48, in July.

Senator JAVITS, who is standing for reelection this year, stressed that the study, to be privately financed through contributions, would be nonpolitical and that members of the task force would have "no strings" on them in their work.

The New York Republican said, however, that he hopes the study, after assessing the practicability of the Anderson-Javits approach, might be able to recommend changes that would improve it and make it more understandable and acceptable to the public.

SPONSORS NOT BOUND

He said he had advised Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, that